



Environmental Planning Commission

***Agenda Number: 2
Project #: 1007958
Case #s: 09EPC-40053, 09EPC-40056
October 15, 2009***

Staff Report

<i>Agent</i>	Tierra West
<i>Applicant</i>	Larry H. Miller Chrysler Jeep Dodge
<i>Requests</i>	1. Zone Map Amendment 2. Site Development Plan for Building Permit
<i>Legal Description</i>	Lot 36B-1, Block S, Bosque Redondo Addition
<i>Location</i>	8528 Lomas Blvd. NE (SW corner of Lomas and Wyoming Blvds.)
<i>Size</i>	Approximately 5 acres
<i>Existing Zoning</i>	C-2, P
<i>Proposed Zoning</i>	C-2

Staff Recommendation

APPROVAL of 09EPC-40056, based on the Findings beginning on Page 17, and subject to the Condition of Approval beginning on Page 20.

APPROVAL of 09EPC-40053, based on the Findings beginning on Page 20, and subject to the Conditions of Approval on Page 22.

Staff Planner

Catalina Lehner, AICP-Staff Planner

Summary of Analysis

This proposal is for a zone map amendment and a site development plan for building permit for an approx. 5 acre site. The applicant proposes a new, updated vehicle sales facility to replace the existing buildings, which were also used for vehicle sales.

The subject site is mostly zoned C-2, except for a strip of P zoning along the southern end which the applicant proposes to change to C-2. The site development plan is not contingent upon the zone map amendment request.

The subject site lies in the Established Urban area. The La Mesa Sector Development Plan applies. Staff finds that the proposal furthers a preponderance of applicable Goals and policies, and that the zone map amendment request has been adequately justified pursuant to R-270-1980.

A facilitated meeting was recommended, but not held. The applicant had previously met with neighbors, who did not express concern. Staff recommends conditional approval of the zone map amendment and the site development plan for building permit.

City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 09/08/2009 to 09/18/2009.
Agency comments used in the preparation of this report begin on Page 28.

I. AREA CHARACTERISTICS AND ZONING HISTORY

Surrounding zoning, plan designations, and land uses:

	<i>Zoning</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan Area; Applicable Rank II & III Plans</i>	<i>Land Use</i>
<i>Site</i>	C-2, P	Established Urban La Mesa Sector Development Plan	Commercial (vehicle sales)
<i>North</i>	C-2	Established Urban	Commercial (vehicle sales)
<i>South</i>	C-2, R-1	Established Urban La Mesa Sector Development Plan	Single-family homes
<i>East</i>	SU-1 for Golf Course and Related Facilities	Established Urban	Recreational (golf course)
<i>West</i>	C-2, O-1, P	Established Urban La Mesa Sector Development Plan	Commercial (vehicle sales), office

II. INTRODUCTION

Proposal & Context

This two-part proposal is for a site development plan for building permit and a zone map amendment for Lot 36B-1, Bosque Redondo Addition, an approx. 5 acre site at the SW corner of Lomas Blvd. and Wyoming and Blvd. (the “subject site”). The applicant proposes to construct a new, updated vehicle sales and service facility to replace the existing buildings, which were also used for vehicle sales.

The approx. 2.3 acre site to the west, across Virginia St., is not a part of the current proposal. However, it is under the same ownership as the subject site and will be used for vehicle display when the proposed building is under construction.

The subject site is mostly zoned C-2, except for a small strip of P zoning. The P zoned strip, approx. 74 ft. wide, extends east-west across the subject site’s southern side for approx. 0.5 ac. The applicant proposes to change the P zoned strip from P to C-2 so all of the subject site will be zoned C-2.

The subject site is located at the SW corner of Lomas and Wyoming Blvds. Across Lomas Blvd. to the north is a commercial use (vehicle sales) and vacant land. To the south is a commercial use (vehicle sales) and single-family homes. East of the subject site, across Wyoming Blvd., is a golf course. To the west are commercial uses (more vehicle sales) and single-family homes further west. The subject site is not located in a designated Activity Center. The State Fair Community Activity Center lies approx. 0.8 mile west of the subject site.

History

The earliest record found regarding the subject site is from 1959. In April 1959, the City Planning Commission (CPC) denied a request for a zone map amendment from R-1 to C-1 for a southwestern portion of the subject site (Z-687, V-217). Upon the City's establishment of zoning in 1959, this southwestern portion of the subject site was most likely zoned R-1. Records indicate that the majority of the subject site was zoned C-2, which was probably original zoning.

In October 1960, the CPC voted to recommend approval to the City Commission (CC) of a zone map amendment for several small lots in the area, including a portion of the subject site. In November 1960, the CC approved the approx. 2 acre zone change (Z-1027, V-305, S-1111). This change affected the southwestern and southern portions of the subject site, which were rezoned to P-1. The reasoning for the change is not apparent from the records, though perhaps the idea was to use the parking areas to buffer the residential area to the south from future commercial uses.

There are no additional records of Planning Commission (PC) decisions. Some minor Development Review Board (DRB) actions occurred in the mid 1990s (DRB-96-301, DRB-96-424, DRB-97-382). Due to the subject site's straight C-2 zoning, the vehicle dealership which previously operated on the subject site probably was approved at the building permit stage and was not considered at the PC level. Though unclear when the previous vehicle dealership was constructed, the use "vehicle sales" has a long history of occupying the subject site.

Long Range Roadway System

The Long Range Roadway System (LRRS) map, produced by the Mid-Region Council of Governments (MRCOG), identifies the functional classifications of roadways. Lomas Blvd. and Wyoming Blvd. are Principal Arterials with a right-of-way (ROW) of 156 ft. Virginia St. is a local street.

Public Facilities/Community Services

Transit: Route #11-Lomas, passes the subject site on Lomas Blvd. in the eastbound direction. Route #31-Wyoming, and Route #98-Peak hour Wyoming, pass the subject site on Wyoming Blvd. in the southbound direction. The Comprehensive Plan designates both Lomas and Wyoming Blvds. as Enhanced Transit Corridors.

Police: The Phil Chacon Memorial Substation, at 800 Louisiana SE, provides police coverage.

Fire: The closest fire station is located about one mile southwest of the subject site, on Central Ave.

ZONING

The majority of the subject site is currently zoned C-2 (Community Commercial), except for an approx. 65 ft. strip of P (Parking) zoning that runs west-east along the subject site's southern side. The proposed zoning is C-2, which would result in the whole site being zoned C-2.

The P zone (Zoning Code §14-16-2-26) provides “sites suitable for parking of automotive vehicles.” The only permissive uses are off-street parking and parking lot. The only conditional use is a structure such as an attendant shelter or restrooms.

The C-2 (Community Commercial) zone “provides suitable sites for offices, for most service and commercial activities, and for certain specified institutional uses” (see Zoning Code §14-16-2-17). The proposed use falls under “Vehicle sales, rental, service, repair and storage, both indoor and outdoor” and first appears in the C-2 zone (§14-16-2-17(A)(13)(b)).

B) Sector Development Plan: The subject site is within the boundaries of the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP). The LMSDP does not establish zoning and does not use the SU-2 designation (Zoning Code §14-16-2-23).

Definitions (Zoning Code §14-16-1-5)

Contiguous. Abutting or separated by nothing more than an alley.

Premises. Any lot or combination of contiguous lots held in single ownership, together with the development thereon; there may be multiple occupancy.

Shopping Center Site. A premises containing five or more acres zoned P, C-1, C-2, C-3, M-1, M-2 or a combination thereof; but excluding premises used and proposed to be used only for manufacturing, assembling, treating, repairing, rebuilding, wholesaling, and warehousing.

III. ANALYSIS -CONFORMANCE TO ADOPTED PLANS AND POLICIES

A) Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan (Rank I)

The subject site is located in an area that the Albuquerque/Bernalillo County Comprehensive Plan has designated Established Urban. The Goal of Developing and Established Urban Areas is “to create a quality urban environment which perpetuates the tradition of identifiable, individual but integrated communities within the metropolitan area and which offers variety and maximum choice in housing, transportation, work areas and life styles, while creating a visually pleasing built environment.” Applicable policies include:

Land Use Policies-

Policy II.B.5a: The Developing Urban and Established Urban areas as shown by the Plan map shall allow a full range of urban land uses, resulting in an overall gross density up to 5 dwelling units per acre.

The area is characterized by land use variety including commercial uses (retail and service), residential uses (single and multi- family) and a recreational use. The proposal would generally promote variety of urban land use. The proposed C-2 zoning would allow for a variety of commercial uses. Though the currently proposed site development plan shows a vehicle

dealership, the zoning goes with the land. Therefore, generally, the proposal furthers Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses.

Policy II.B.5d: The location, intensity and design of new development shall respect existing neighborhood values, natural environmental conditions and carrying capacities, scenic resources, and resources of other social, cultural, recreational concern.

The proposal generally furthers Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. The location on two major arterials, the relatively low intensity of the use and site plan controls regarding noise would result in a proposal that would respect neighborhood values and other resources. There is no known neighborhood opposition.

Policy II.B.5e: New growth shall be accommodated through development in areas where vacant land is contiguous to existing or programmed urban facilities and services and where the integrity of existing neighborhoods can be ensured.

The proposal furthers Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban facilities and services, the use of which is unlikely to disrupt neighborhood integrity.

Policy II.B.5i: Employment and service uses shall be located to complement residential areas and shall be sited to minimize adverse effects of noise, lighting, pollution, and traffic on residential environments.

Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location is partially furthered. The building is proposed near the middle of the subject site and could be further from the residences to the south. However, the wall, landscape buffer and site plan controls regarding noise would help to minimize adverse effects on the residential area.

Policy II.B.5j: Where new commercial development occurs, it should generally be located in existing commercially zoned areas as follows:

- In small neighborhood-oriented centers provided with pedestrian and bicycle access within reasonable distance of residential areas for walking or bicycling.
- In larger area-wide shopping centers located at intersections of arterial streets and provided with access via mass transit; more than one shopping center should be allowed at an intersection only when transportation problems do not result.
- In freestanding retailing and contiguous storefronts along streets in older neighborhoods.

The subject site is not in any of the locations where commercial development should generally be located. It is not a small neighborhood-oriented center or a larger area-wide shopping center. Nor is free-standing retailing proposed. However, the subject site is an existing commercially

zoned area. The proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development.

Policy II.B.5k: Land adjacent to arterial streets shall be planned to minimize harmful effects of traffic; livability and safety of established residential neighborhoods shall be protected in transportation planning and operations.

Adjacent to Lomas and Wyoming Blvds., the subject site would have two entrances on its western side (facing Virginia St.) before the street reaches the residences to the south. Virginia St. is the main access point for this established residential neighborhood, so its livability and safety could potentially be affected. The proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5k-land adjacent to arterial streets.

Policy II.B.5l: Quality and innovation in design shall be encouraged in all new development; design shall be encouraged which is appropriate to the plan area.

The proposed building generally includes architectural elements and colors that would be appropriate for new development along this portion of Lomas Blvd. and in the Plan area. However, some parts of the building would benefit from an additional, required design element. The proposal partially furthers Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development.

Environmental Protection & Heritage Conservation

Noise Goal: The goal is to protect the public health and welfare and enhance the quality of life by reducing noise and by preventing new land use/noise conflicts.

The proposed use will include service and repair, which often generates noise. The service bays would be located approx. 50 ft. north of the residences to the south. Though the service doors would remain closed during business hours, there could still be some noise issues. Loudspeakers would not be allowed on the lot. The proposal partially furthers the Noise Goal.

B) La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP) (Rank III)

The La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP) was first adopted in November 1976 (Resolution 190-1976) and was amended in May 1978. The LMSDP generally encompasses properties between Lomas Blvd. to the north, Wyoming Blvd. to the east, Central Ave. to the south and Louisiana Blvd. to the west. Specific boundaries are shown on Page 3 of the Plan.

The overarching goal of the LMSDP is to guide renewal of the area and improvement of the living conditions of low and moderate income families by upgrading housing, public facilities and City services in the area (p. 13). The Plan's long-term and short-term objectives are set forth on p. 14. The LMSDP did not establish zoning. Therefore, zone changes within its boundaries do not require a sector plan map amendment.

Objective 4 (long-term): Enhancement of the area as a primarily residential area with strips of commercial uses on the north, east and south.

The proposal furthers Objective 4 because a commercial use is proposed on the northeast corner of the Plan area, within the commercial strip along the area's northern and eastern sides.

IV. ZONE MAP AMENDMENT

RESOLUTION 270-1980 (POLICIES FOR ZONE MAP AMENDMENTS)

Requirements

Resolution 270-1980 outlines policies and requirements for deciding zone map amendment (zone change) applications. The applicant must provide sound justification for the proposed change and demonstrate that several tests have been met. The burden is on the applicant to show why a change should be made.

The applicant must demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because of one of three findings: 1) there was an error when the existing zone map pattern was created; or 2) changed neighborhood or community conditions justify the change; or 3) a different land use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan or other City master plan(s).

Request

The subject site is currently zoned mostly C-2 (Community Commercial) with a strip of P (Parking) zoning (approx. 74 ft. deep) along its southern side. The requested zoning is C-2.

The applicant's reason for eliminating the P zoning is twofold: 1) so the proposed building can be sited in the location shown on the site development plan, and 2) so zoning on the subject site would be a single designation. In this case, shifting the proposed building out of the P zoned area would render a zone change unnecessary. However, the applicant has decided to request a zone change rather than alter the proposed site layout.

Justification & Analysis

The October 1, 2009 zone change justification letter, a response to Staff's request for a revised justification, is analyzed here (see attachment). The applicant believes that the proposed zone map amendment (zone change) conforms to R270-1980 as elaborated in the letter. Staff analysis is in **bold text**. The citation in quotes is from R270-1980.

Section 1A:

"A proposed zone change must be found to be consistent with the health, safety, morals and general welfare of the City."

The applicant states that the area has been used for the same activity for decades and the neighbors are accustomed to the use. The proposed change is required to update the site and is consistent with the City's health, morals, safety and general welfare. The request is supported by a number of policy justifications (see Section C). The site plan states that amplified sound is not allowed, which will promote safety and welfare.

Staff finds this explanation acceptable. Consistency with the City's health, safety, morals and general welfare of the City is typically demonstrated by showing that the request furthers goals and policies in applicable Plans, which is done adequately here in the response to Section 1C. Staff does not agree that the proposed change is required to update the site; rather, it is the applicant's desire. The site development plan for building permit could move forward without the proposed zone change if the proposed building were to be shifted north by approx. 25 ft, out of the P zoned area.

Section 1B:

"Stability of land use and zoning is desirable; therefore, the applicant must provide a sound justification for the change. The burden is on the applicant to show why the change should be made, not on the City to show why the change should not be made."

The applicant asserts that changing the zoning designation from P to C-2 will bring stability to the site and will help the car dealership use to continue. A single zoning designation over the entire lot will provide stability by allowing a use that has been on the site for many years to continue.

Staff believes that the intent is to not introduce uses that would adversely affect stability of existing land use and zoning. The fact that the use would not change at this time would generally contribute to stability in the area. Also, the applicant must justify the zone change request. Though the applicant has explained the reasoning, Staff notes that a zone change is not necessary for the car dealership use to continue. Development of the new car dealership could occur by shifting the proposed building out of the P zoned area.

Section 1C:

"A proposed change shall not be in significant conflict with adopted elements of the Comprehensive Plan or other City master plans and amendments thereto including privately developed area plans which have been adopted by the City."

Applicant's citations:

Comprehensive Plan: Land Use Policies II.B.5d, 5l, 5o, the Noise Goal and Noise Policy a.

La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP): long-term objectives 1 and 2.

Staff finds the policy citations sufficient overall, and agrees that many policies do not apply. For the policies that do apply, the applicant's explanations are adequate. The applicant

provides acceptable explanations of how the request furthers each cited policy and Goal. The discussion of relevant Comprehensive Plan policies is well thought out and the subparts of the policies are addressed.

The discussion of LMSDP policies is not as strong, but the applicant substantiates the reasoning. Staff agrees that the LMSDP's short-term objectives are not applicable, but does not necessarily agree with the argument that the subject site's redevelopment (and therefore elimination of blighting influences and detrimental conditions) is contingent upon the zone change. However, Staff concludes that overall the policy discussion is adequate and that there is not a "significant conflict" with applicable Plans, so the test in Section 1C is met.

Section 1D:

"The applicant must demonstrate that the existing zoning is inappropriate because:

- 1) there was an error when the existing zone map pattern was created, or
- 2) changed neighborhood or community conditions justify the change, or
- 3) a different use category is more advantageous to the community, as articulated in the comprehensive Plan or other City master plan, even though (1) and (2) above do not apply."

One of the above reasons is required for the applicant's demonstration under Section 1D. The applicant chooses reason 3, and further states that the proposed C-2 zoning contains setback and landscaping requirements that the P zone does not. Applicable policies from the Comprehensive Plan and the LMSDP are cited in Section 1C of the justification letter.

By the policy-based discussion in Section 1C, Staff finds that the applicant has generally demonstrated that the proposed zoning could be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning. However, not changing the zoning could be equally advantageous to the community. In this case, Staff finds that there is no net beneficial effect to community.

Rather, the proposed zone change would mostly benefit the applicant because the proposed building would not have to be shifted northward out of the P zone and further away from the residences. Staff does not agree that the zoning must be changed to allow landscape buffers and setbacks. While correct that the C-2 zone specifies setbacks and the P zone does not, the landscape buffer between commercial and residential uses is required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-10(E)(4) and would apply regardless of the zoning.

Section 1E:

"A change of zone shall not be approved where some of the permissive uses in the zone would be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community."

The applicant states that the zone change would not be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community because the majority of C-2 uses are intended for area

residents' day-to-day use. The site is 5 acres in size and is a shopping center by definition, so it would have to be reviewed by the EPC. The majority of C-2 uses permissive uses would not be harmful. A circus or carnival is unlikely to locate on the site and alcoholic drink sales have to be further than 500 ft. from a residential zone, which is immediately south of the site.

Staff finds the explanation acceptable. The applicant addresses the idea of harm by discussing permissive uses in the C-2 zone as required and correctly states that any development requests for the subject site would return to the EPC.

Section 1F:

"A proposed zone change which, to be utilized through land development, requires major and unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City may be:

- 1) denied due to lack of capital funds, or
- 2) granted with the implicit understanding that the City is not bound to provide the capital improvements on any special schedule."

The applicant states that the proposed zone change will require no major or unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City. Staff agrees.

Section 1G:

"The cost of land or other economic considerations pertaining to the applicant shall not be the determining factor for a change of zone."

The applicant states that land cost and other economic considerations are not the purpose behind the zone change request. The purpose is to create continuity of zoning for the entire 5 ac. site.

Economic considerations are a factor in the proposed zone change. The applicant's choice to not move the proposed building out of the P zoned strip is an economic decision in favor of a particular site layout. Staff finds, however, that this economic factor is not the determining factor because alternative site layouts would also be economic considerations. Also, the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed zone change furthers a preponderance of relevant policies (see the response to Section 1C).

Section 1H:

"Location on a collector or major street is not in itself sufficient justification of apartment, office or commercial zoning."

The applicant states that the P zoned area is not located on a collector or major street, but is located east of Virginia St. which is a local street. Staff agrees.

Section 1I:

“A zone change request which would give a zone different from surrounding zoning to one small area, especially when only premise is involved, is generally called a ‘spot zone’. Such a change of zone may be approved only when:

- 1) the change will clearly facilitate realization of the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable adopted sector development plan or area development plan, or
- 2) the area of the proposed zone change is different from surrounding land because it could function as a transition between adjacent zones, because the site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone due to topography, traffic or special adverse land uses nearby, or because the nature of structures already on the premises makes the site unsuitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone.”

The applicant believes that the proposed zone change from P to C-2 would not create a spot zone, and further states that the change would eliminate a spot zone and incorporate it into the existing C-2 area. Staff agrees that the request would not create a spot zone, but believes that the P zoned strip is a strip zone rather than a spot zone. Also, there is other C-2 zoning in the immediate vicinity.

Section 1J:

“A zone change request which would give a zone different from surrounding zoning to a strip of land along a street is generally called ‘strip zoning’. Strip commercial zoning will be approved only where:

- 1) the change will clearly facilitate realization of the Comprehensive Plan and any applicable adopted sector development plan or area development plan, and
- 2) the area of the proposed zone change is different from surrounding land because it could function as a transition between adjacent zones or because the site is not suitable for the uses allowed in any adjacent zone due to traffic or special adverse land uses nearby.”

The applicant believes that the proposed zone change will not create a strip zone. Though the P zoned area meets the definition of a strip zone, there is C-2 zoning to the north, east and west. The zone change will actually eliminate a strip zone.

Staff concurs that the P zoned area can be considered a strip zone by definition, and that the request would not result in a strip zone. This is because the request would not result in a zone different from surrounding zoning. C-2 is the most prevalent zoning in the vicinity of the subject site.

Staff Conclusion

Staff concludes that the applicant has adequately justified the zone map amendment (zone change) pursuant to R270-1980. Upon the applicant’s policy-based demonstration, Staff finds no “significant conflict” with adopted elements of applicable Plans (Section 1C).

Also, Staff finds that the use would be generally consistent with the City's health, safety and welfare (Section 1A) and would not be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community (Section 1E). The response to Section 1D is not as thorough as it could be, but is acceptable. The remaining sections of R270-1980 (1A, 1B, 1E, 1F, 1G, 1H and 1I) are sufficiently addressed. For these reasons, Staff recommends approval of the zone map amendment (zone change) request.

V. SITE DEVELOPMENT PLAN FOR BUILDING PERMIT

Site Plan Layout / Configuration

The proposed site development plan consists of a 76,074 sf building with parking areas on the northern and eastern sides of the site. The existing buildings, which are close to Wyoming Blvd., would be demolished. The proposed building would consist of a basement (parts warehouse), ground level (showroom/repair) and a second floor (offices, more parts).

Refuse Enclosure: The refuse enclosure is proposed at the subject site's southeastern corner and is approved by the Solid Waste Management Division (SWMD), which states that it must comply with the Solid Waste Ordinance. The enclosure gate color needs to be specified at this time.

Walls/Fences

There is an existing 7.5 ft. CMU wall along the subject site's southern side, separating it from the single-family homes to the south. The wall is tan and grey, unfinished CMU block with pilasters and a red, 4 in. CMU cap on the pilasters and a red, horizontal stripe in the middle. The wall detail does not match the existing wall, which is in poor condition and needs to be refinished.

A chain link fence with barbed wire exists along a southern portion of the subject site, where vehicles are stored. A chain link gate with slats is proposed on the building's southern elevation. No other walls or fences are proposed.

Vehicular Access, Circulation & Parking

Access & Circulation: The subject site is currently accessed from Lomas Blvd. and Wyoming Blvds. via existing entrances. The existing access drives on Wyoming Blvd. are proposed to be closed. A secondary entrance exists near the subject site's northwestern corner, on Virginia St. Another secondary entrance is proposed further south on Virginia St. The access along the southern boundary, abutting the residences, is proposed to be closed off.

The existing access on Lomas Blvd. is recommended for closure to comply with current transportation requirements (see Agency comments). If absolutely necessary, the access could be relocated to the east to allow for right-in, right-out access and improved on-site circulation. The existing access from Lomas Blvd., which does not meet current Transportation requirements, could create unsafe conditions because it runs right into the proposed plaza area and makes a winding alignment of the site entrance. The relocated entrance would allow for more vehicle display parking and a safer plaza area.

Parking: Zoning Code §14-16-3-1, Off Street Parking Regulations, was used to calculate parking. For the proposed office and retail uses, 1 space is required for every 200 sf on the ground level and 1 sp/300 sf on other levels. 313 spaces are required. For the warehouse use, 5 spaces are required (1 sp/2000 sf), for a total of 318 required spaces. Reductions were applied for proximity to Transit (10%, or 32 spaces) and for service bays used as parking (46 bays total). $318 - 78 = 240$ required spaces.

283 spaces are shown around the perimeter of the proposed building. Staff points out that the service bay reduction, which is not provided for in the Zoning Code, is unnecessary. $283 + 46 = 329$ required spaces, and is more than the 318 minimum, required spaces. As long as the minimum parking requirement is met, excess parking is allowable. Without the service bay reduction, there would be 11 excess spaces.

8 handicap (HC) spaces, required for 101-300 regular spaces, are provided. 5 motorcycle (MC) spaces are required for 151-300 spaces. 6 MC spaces are provided in a visible location near the main entrance as required, though MC parking signage is needed. 14 bicycle spaces are required (with or without the service bay reduction). Two bicycle racks are proposed on the side of the building, near the main entrance.

TIS: A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation

The proposed pedestrian improvements consist of 6 ft. pedestrian crosswalks from Lomas Blvd. to the main building entrance and east-west (from Wyoming Blvd.) across the subject site. Such pedestrian connections are required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-1(H), Off-Street Parking Regulations, and must be clearly demarcated. Clear demarcation, such as textured (scored) colored concrete or thermoplastic, is needed across parking lot subareas and drive aisle crossings but is only proposed in a few locations.

Pedestrian sidewalks are required along the length of major façades containing primary entrances pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(1). The minimum required width is 8 ft. The proposed, approx. 6 ft. pedestrian sidewalk does not comply. Required sidewalk width increases depending upon building square footage. For the proposed 76,074 sf building, a 14 ft. sidewalk is required. However, the sidewalk width is allowed to vary provided that the average required width is maintained and the width does not go below 8 ft. Staff calculates an average width of 11 ft., but the 6 ft. width is non-compliant. The 8 ft., clear width is required and needs to be provided.

Transit Access

Transit access to the subject site is good and will improve with the proposed pedestrian connections. There are 2 bus stops adjacent to the subject site. One is on Lomas Blvd., approx. 60 ft. west of the Lomas/Wyoming intersection. The second is on Wyoming Blvd., approx. 150 ft. south of the intersection.

Lighting & Security

There are existing light poles on the subject site, though it is unclear from the site development plan which ones these are. In other instances, there are light pole symbols in odd locations (ex. near the southwestern corner in the parking area).

New light poles are proposed on the subject site's eastern and western sides. The new poles are black metal, 20 ft. high from top to grade and have 2 shoebox fixtures. Any light poles that would be within 100 ft. of a residential zone of the abutting residential zone to the south cannot exceed 16 ft. from top to grade [§14-16-3-9(F)]. Light poles in the vehicle display area need to be protected by concrete bollards, which is standard for car lots. No wall-pack lighting is proposed.

Landscaping Plan

Existing landscaping is found along a portion of Lomas Blvd., Wyoming Blvd. and Virginia St. Trees exist along Lomas Blvd. The proposed landscaping plan does not distinguish well between existing and proposed plant material. Six types of trees, shrubs, grasses and groundcovers are proposed. Grey gravel is also proposed.

New landscaping buffers along all sides of the subject site are proposed because they are required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-10(E). The subject site had developed prior to the existence of these regulations. Minimum buffer size is 6 ft. for the side and rear, except that the southern buffer must be a minimum of 10 ft. wide because it is between a commercial and a residential use. Front buffers must be at least 10 ft. wide for 3 acre sites, increasing by one ft. for each 2 ac. size increase. Therefore, the front buffer must be at least 11 ft. wide. The proposed 14 ft. buffer complies. However, the 9 ft. buffer on the subject site's northwestern corner will need to be increased.

The City Forester commented that 75% of trees in the parking lot need to be shade trees pursuant to §14-16-3-10(G)(1)(d) and that Redbuds and Chitalpa don't meet this requirement. He further states that low spreading trees would block the view of the cars, and that larger trees would create an open view. Besides, stated sizes for Redbud and Chitalpa can't be expected in Albuquerque, much less in the center of a parking lot in such small planters.

Also proposed is Arizona Ash, which is allergenic and not on the City's Forrester's list of preferred trees. Staff suggests replacement with a hardier tree due to the heat that the asphalt will generate. See <http://www.cabq.gov/albuquerquegreen/green-goals/trees/> [albuquerquegreen/](http://www.albuquerquegreen.org/green-goals/trees/) [green-goals/](http://www.albuquerquegreen.org/green-goals/trees/Planting%20Trees) [trees/](http://www.albuquerquegreen.org/green-goals/trees/Planting%20Trees) [Planting%20Trees](http://www.albuquerquegreen.org/green-goals/trees/Planting%20Trees) for the Forrester's suggestions.

In some places, such as a portion of the western buffer and the western island across from it, the required 75% coverage with living, vegetative materials appears to not be provided. Tree canopies do not count. Additional plant material is needed.

Sustainability/Water Harvesting

The City Forester commented that there is water harvesting potential in the large, proposed islands along Wyoming Blvd. and near the subject site's SW corner along Virginia St. Pervious pavements

connecting all internal islands could act as water harvesting for trees, reduce heat island impacts, and clean/filter the storm water created on site.

To achieve water harvesting, Staff offers the following suggestions: add curb notches to landscape islands and buffers so that runoff water can be used for supplemental irrigation, and that the landscaping islands be at grade with the parking lot (not raised) so the curb notches can function.

Architecture & Design

The architectural theme is contemporary. The proposed building is 36 ft. tall at its highest point. The majority of the parapet height is 29 ft., 4 in. The 1/8: 1 scale is incorrect. The applicant corrected the

scale to 3/32: 1, but did not switch out sheets. Staff has checked the called out measurements and finds them to be “off” by approx. 0.5 ft.

The proposed building is predominantly light grey with a sandblasted finish. Medium grey paint is called out, but not used anywhere. Metal panels are proposed on the main elevation. The desired color option (silver metallic or Delphi silver) needs to be specified at this time. A dark grey, split-face CMU wainscot is proposed. The windows and doors are aluminum. Information for the service doors is not provided, but should be.

The Design Standards for All Non-Residential Uses found Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (D)(2) apply. The proposed building is approx. 267 ft. long by 263 ft. long, though the façades are each “bumped out” to varying extents. Major facades greater than 100 ft. in length are required to break up building mass by applying two of the seven design options listed:

- a. wall plane projections/recesses at least every 100 ft.
- b. vertical change in color, texture or material every 50 ft.
- c. an offset, reveal, pilaster or projecting element at least every 50 ft.
- d. cornice or base treatments
- e. art coordinated through the City’s art program
- f. change in parapet height for every 100 ft. in length, or
- g. any other treatment that meets the intent of this section.

The south elevation and the east elevation (mis-labeled as the west elevation) of the proposed building do not comply with Zoning Code minimum requirements for design. On the south elevation, for approx. 176 ft. only one element has been applied; the wainscot as a base treatment. The same is the case for the east elevation. Another design option needs to be applied to each elevation to create compliance. Staff suggests a vertical change in color, texture or material every 50 ft.

Signage

There are two existing free-standing signs, one on the northeast corner and the other on the north, middle portion of the subject site. The applicant has recently updated the signs, as shown by the photos (Sheet C7). Colors are now specified. Dimensions (and lighting, if any) are not specified but should be.

Letters should be at least 70% contrast with the background and not all capitals. Since the sign update was recent, this information should be available and is needed for this submittal.

The applicant must provide evidence of the updated signs' dimensions. It is likely that the updated signs comply with the signage regulations in the C-2 zone, which allow signs up to 250 sf if the site is on an arterial street. Compliance with the Shopping Center (SC) regulations (SC) must also be determined. Staff finds that that number of signs (2) complies, but suspects that the dimensions do not. A free-standing sign on a SC site cannot exceed 150 sf pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-2(B)(4).

Building-mounted signage is proposed as follows: 6 signs on the main (northern) façade and one sign on the east (mis-labeled as west) façade. Square footage needs to be calculated and shown for each. Most of the signs are black, except for the Jeep sign (green) and the Dodge sign (red). The signs range from approx. 9 sf to 49 sf.

Grading & Drainage Plan

The subject site is slopes downward from its southeastern corner to its northwestern corner. The respective elevations are approx. 5,369 ft. to 5,362 ft. for a grade change of 7 ft. The contour lines have changed from the previous version of the grading and drainage plan and now more closely match the contour lines on the AGIS system. The subject site does not lie in a 100-yr. flood plane. No new retaining walls or ponding areas are proposed.

Utility Plan

An existing water line and sewer line run along both Lomas and Wyoming Blvds. The proposed building will connect to the existing sewer line along Virginia St. and the existing water line along Wyoming Blvd. There are existing utility poles along Lomas Blvd. Existing fire hydrants are near the subject site's northwestern and northeastern corners.

Public Outdoor Space

Starting with buildings 60,000 sf or greater, public outdoor space is required pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(4) at the rate of 400 sf for every 30,000 sf of building. 800 sf of outdoor space are needed to comply with this provision. A plaza area, approx. 900 sf, is proposed in the parking lot near the building's northern (main) side. The plaza location, however, is unsafe because it is straight in front of the entrance from Lomas Blvd. If this entrance is relocated (see the Vehicular Access section of this report), the plaza would be safer and functional.

Building with 6 or more water closets shall provide outdoor gathering space for employees pursuant to §14-16-3-18(D)(3). An approx. 121 sf patio is proposed on the site's southern side, which is below the minimum required size of 300 sf. Shading is required, but it is unknown how this is provided.

Also, seating must be incorporated along at least one façade at the rate of 1 seat for every 25 linear ft. of façade pursuant to subsection (C)(B). A bench is proposed near the main entrance, though no specifics are provided. The main (northern) façade is 267 ft. long. $267/25 = 10.68$, or 11 seats, are required.

Concerns of Reviewing Agencies/Pre-Hearing Discussion

The applicant was present at the pre-hearing discussion on September 23, 2009. City Departments and other interested agencies reviewed this application from 9/8/09 to 9/18/09. Transportation Development, Transit, the City Forrester and PNM offered comments. Agency comments begin on p. 28 of this report.

VI. NEIGHBORHOOD CONCERNS

Two neighborhood organizations were required to be notified: the La Mesa Community Improvement Association (LMCIA) and the District 6 Coalition of Neighborhoods. The applicant notified them as required (see attachments).

The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) recommended a facilitated meeting. However, neighborhood representatives declined the offer and no meeting was held. The applicant had spoken to neighborhood representatives prior to submitting the proposal and had found no objections. As of this writing, there is no known neighborhood or other opposition. Staff has received a letter of support from a vehicle dealership across the street.

VII. CONCLUSION

This two-part proposal is for a zone map amendment and a site development plan for building permit for an approx. 5 acre site at the southwestern corner of Lomas and Wyoming Blvds. The applicant proposes to change a portion of the subject site's zoning from P (Parking) to C-2 (Community Commercial) so that the proposed building could be sited in the location shown on the site development plan, and so the subject site would have one type of zoning.

Staff concludes that the applicant has adequately justified the zone map amendment (zone change) pursuant to R270-1980. The main arguments in Sections 1C and 1E, which are key elements of a zone change justification, show that there is no "significant conflict" with applicable Plans and that the zone change would not be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community. The remaining sections of R270-1980 (1A, 1B, 1D, 1F, 1G, 1H and 1I) are sufficiently addressed.

A facilitated meeting was recommended but not held. Neighbors have not expressed any concerns. There is general support from a nearby dealership and no known opposition. Staff recommends approval of the zone map amendment and the site development plan for building permit, with conditions which would create compliance and consistency within the submittal.

FINDINGS - 09EPC 40056, October 15, 2009- Zone Map Amendment

1. The subject request is for a zone map amendment for an approximately 0.5 acre portion of an approximately 5 acre site located at the southwestern corner of Lomas and Wyoming Boulevards. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP).
2. The zone map amendment is for a change from P (Parking) to C-2 (Community Commercial). The applicant proposes to redevelop the subject site with another vehicle dealership. The zone map amendment would create uniform zoning on the subject site, so that the proposed building could be placed where the P zoning existed.
3. Because the subject site is not greater than 10 acres, the Environmental Planning Commission (EPC) is the approval authority. The subject request is not required to be transmitted to the City Council.
4. The subject request is accompanied by a request for a site development plan for building permit (09EPC-40053).
5. The Comprehensive Plan, the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP) and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.
6. The subject request furthers the following relevant Comprehensive Plan policies:
 - A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal would generally promote urban land use variety because the proposed C-2 zoning would allow many commercial uses. Though the proposed site development plan is for a vehicle dealership, the zoning goes with the land.
 - B. Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. The location on two major arterials and the relatively low intensity of the use would generally respect neighborhood values and other resources. There is no known neighborhood opposition.

- C. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban facilities and services, the use of which is unlikely to disrupt neighborhood integrity.

7. The subject request partially furthers the following relevant Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies:

- A. Noise Goal. The service bays would be located approx. 50 ft. north of existing residences. Though the service doors would remain closed during business hours and loudspeakers would not be allowed, there is still some potential for noise issues. However, the subject site is already zoned for commercial uses.
- B. Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location. The building is proposed near the middle of the subject site and could be further from the residences to the south. However, the wall, landscape buffer and site plan controls regarding noise would help to minimize adverse effects on the residential area.
- C. Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development. The subject site is not in any of the locations where commercial development should generally be located. It is not a small neighborhood-oriented center or a larger area-wide shopping center. Nor is free-standing retailing proposed. However, the subject site is an existing commercially zoned area.
- D. Policy II.B.5k-land adjacent to arterial streets. Adjacent to Lomas and Coors Blvds., the subject site would have two entrances on its western side (facing Virginia St.) before the street reaches the residences to the south. Virginia St. is the main access point for this established residential neighborhood, so its livability and safety could potentially be affected.
- E. Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development. The proposed building generally includes architectural elements and colors that would be appropriate for new development along this portion of Lomas Blvd. and in the Plan area. However, some parts of the building would benefit from an additional, required design element.

8. The subject request furthers long-term Objective 4 of the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP), which envisioned strips of commercial uses on the north, east and south of residential areas. The proposed commercial use would be located on the northeastern corner of the Plan area, in a commercial strip along the area's northern and eastern sides.

9. The applicant has adequately justified the zone change request pursuant to Resolution 270-1980:

-
- A. Section 1A: The applicant has adequately demonstrated that the proposed zone change is consistent with the City's health, safety, morals and general welfare because the zone change furthers goals and policies in applicable Plans.
 - B. Section 1B: The proposed zone change would not introduce uses that would adversely affect stability of existing land use and zoning in the area. The applicant has adequately demonstrated why the zone change should be made.
 - C. Section 1C: General consistency with the applicable, overarching policies of the Comprehensive Plan and the applicable policies of the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP) has been demonstrated. There is no "significant conflict" with an adopted element of the Comprehensive Plan or other City master plan such as a sector development plan.
 - D. Section 1D: The applicant's policy-based discussion generally demonstrates that the proposed zoning would be more advantageous to the community than the current zoning, as articulated in the Comprehensive Plan and the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP).
 - E. Section 1E: The majority of C-2 uses, which are intended for area residents' day-to-day use, would not be harmful to adjacent property, the neighborhood or the community. Any development requests for the subject site, which is 5 acres in size, would return to the EPC.
 - F. Section 1F: The proposed zone change would require no major or unprogrammed capital expenditures by the City.
 - G. Section 1G: Economic considerations are not the determining factor for the proposed zone change. The primary reasons are to allow part of a proposed building where the P zone was, and to have a single zoning designation on the subject site.
 - H. Section 1H: The P zoned area is not located on a collector or major street. Therefore, such location is not being used as justification for the proposed zone change.
 - I. Section 1I: The proposed zone change would not create a spot zone. The proposed C-2 zoning would be the same as most of the zoning in the area.
 - J. Section 1J: The proposed zone change would not create a strip zone, but would eliminate one. The request would result in zoning that is the same as the majority of the surrounding zoning in the area.

10. The affected neighborhood associations (NAs) are the La Mesa Community Improvement Association (LMCIA) and the District 6 Coalition of NAs. The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) recommended a facilitated meeting, but neighborhood representatives declined and no meeting

was held. As of this writing, there is no known neighborhood or other opposition. There is general support from a nearby dealership.

RECOMMENDATION - 09EPC 40056, October 15, 2009

APPROVAL of 09EPC 40056, a request for a zone map amendment from P (Parking) to C-2 (Community Commercial), for an approximately 0.5 acre portion of the southern part of Lot 36B-1, Block S, Bosque Redondo Addition, which is an approximately 5 acre site located at the southwestern corner of Lomas Blvd. and Wyoming Blvd., based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Condition of Approval.

CONDITION OF APPROVAL - 09EPC 40056, October 15, 2009—Zone Map Amendment

1. Final DRB sign-off of the accompanying site development plan for building permit (09EPC 40053) is required.

FINDINGS -09EPC 40053, October 15, 2009-Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. The subject request is for a site development plan for building permit for an approximately 5 acre site located at the southwestern corner of Lomas and Wyoming Boulevards. The subject site lies within the boundaries of the Established Urban Area of the Comprehensive Plan and the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP).

2. The subject request is accompanied by a request for a zone map amendment (0EPC-40056). The zone map amendment has been adequately justified pursuant to R270-1980.

3. The Comprehensive Plan, the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP) and the City of Albuquerque Zoning Code are incorporated herein by reference and made part of the record for all purposes.

4. The subject request furthers the following relevant Comprehensive Plan policies:

- A. Policy II.B.5a-full range of urban land uses. The proposal would generally promote urban land use variety because the proposed C-2 zoning would allow many commercial uses. Though the proposed site development plan is for a vehicle dealership, the zoning goes with the land.
 - B. Policy II.B.5d-neighborhood values/natural environmental conditions. The location on two major arterials and the relatively low intensity of the use would generally respect neighborhood values and other resources. There is no known neighborhood opposition.
 - C. Policy II.B.5e-programmed facilities/neighborhood integrity. The subject site is contiguous to existing urban facilities and services, the use of which is unlikely to disrupt neighborhood integrity.
5. The subject request partially furthers the following relevant Comprehensive Plan Goal and policies:
- A. Noise Goal. The service bays would be located approx. 50 ft. north of existing residences. Though the service doors would remain closed during business hours and loudspeakers would not be allowed, there is still some potential for noise issues. However, the subject site is already zoned for commercial uses.
 - B. Policy II.B.5i-employment/service use location. The building is proposed near the middle of the subject site and could be further from the residences to the south. However, the wall, landscape buffer and site plan controls regarding noise would help to minimize adverse effects on the residential area.
 - C. Policy II.B.5j-location of new commercial development. The subject site is not in any of the locations where commercial development should generally be located. It is not a small neighborhood-oriented center or a larger area-wide shopping center. Nor is free-standing retailing proposed. However, the subject site is an existing commercially zoned area.
 - D. Policy II.B.5k-land adjacent to arterial streets. Adjacent to Lomas and Coors Blvds., the subject site would have two entrances on its western side (facing Virginia St.) before the street reaches the residences to the south. Virginia St. is the main access point for this established residential neighborhood, so its livability and safety could potentially be affected.
 - E. Policy II.B.5l-quality design/new development. The proposed building generally includes architectural elements and colors that would be appropriate for new development along this portion of Lomas Blvd. and in the Plan area. However, some parts of the building would benefit from an additional, required design element.

6. The subject request furthers long-term Objective 4 of the La Mesa Sector Development Plan (LMSDP), which envisioned strips of commercial uses on the north, east and south of residential areas. The proposed commercial use would be located on the northeastern corner of the Plan area, in a commercial strip along the area's northern and eastern sides.

7. A Traffic Impact Study (TIS) was not required.

8. The applicant has obtained a Certificate of No Effect to demonstrate compliance with the City's Archaeological Ordinance.

9. The affected neighborhood associations (NAs) are the La Mesa Community Improvement Association (LMCIA) and the District 6 Coalition of NAs. The Office of Neighborhood Coordination (ONC) recommended a facilitated meeting, but neighborhood representatives declined and no meeting was held. As of this writing, there is no known neighborhood or other opposition. There is general support from a nearby dealership.

RECOMMENDATION - 09EPC 40053, October 15, 2009

APPROVAL of 09EPC-40053, a Site Development Plan for Building Permit for Lot 36B-1, Block S, Bosque Redondo Addition, zoned C-2 (Community Commercial) , an approximately 5 acre site located at the southwestern corner of Lomas Blvd. and Wyoming Blvd., based on the preceding Findings and subject to the following Conditions of Approval.

CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL -09EPC 40053, October 15, 2009- Site Development Plan for Building Permit

1. The EPC delegates final sign-off authority of this site development plan to the Development Review Board (DRB). The DRB is responsible for ensuring that all EPC Conditions have been satisfied and that other applicable City requirements have been met. A letter shall accompany the submittal, specifying all modifications that have been made to the site plan since the EPC hearing, including how the site plan has been modified to meet each of the EPC conditions. Unauthorized changes to this site plan, including before or after DRB final sign-off, may result in forfeiture of approvals.

2. Prior to final DRB sign off, the applicant shall meet with the Staff planner to ensure that conditions of approval are met. Evidence of this meeting shall be provided to the DRB at the time of application.

3. Walls/Fences:

The wall detail shall correctly depict the existing wall on the subject site's southern side.

4. Access & Parking:

- A. Drive aisle crossings shall be clearly demarcated by textured (scored) colored concrete or thermoplastic.
- B. A conspicuously posted, upright sign shall indicate the location of the motorcycle parking [Zoning Code §14-16-3-1(C)(2)].

5. Pedestrian and Bicycle Access and Circulation:

- A. Pedestrian pathways that cross parking areas shall be made of textured (scored), colored concrete.
- B. A symbol for textured (scored), colored concrete shall be added to the legend and shall be used consistently on the drawings.
- C. Note 7 shall be clarified to address pedestrian pathways and drive aisle crossings, and specify the material as textured (scored), colored concrete or thermoplastic.

6. Site Lighting:

- A. Any light poles within 100 feet of an abutting residential zone shall not exceed 16 feet from top to grade [Zoning Code §14-16-3-9(F)].
- B. Existing light poles and proposed light poles shall be differentiated on the site development plan.
- C. Light poles in the vehicle display areas shall be protected by concrete bollards.

7. Landscaping- Coverage:

- A. Where coverage with living, vegetative material does not amount to 75% of a planting bed, additional plant material shall be added [§14-16-3-10(G)(3)].

- B. The landscaping buffer near the subject site's northwestern corner shall be at least 11 feet wide [Zoning Code §14-16-3-10(E)].
- C. The numbers used in the landscaping calculations shall be consistent with the numbers used on the site development plan for building permit sheet.

8. Landscaping- Trees:

- A. The landscaping in the southern buffer, which abuts a residential zone, shall consist primarily of trees which shall be at least 8 ft. high at time of planting and capable of reaching a height at maturity of at least 25 ft. [Zoning Code §14-16-3-10(E)(4)].
- B. Spacing of the trees in the southern buffer shall be equal to 75% of the mature canopy diameter of the trees [Zoning Code §14-16-3-10(E)(4)].
- C. The Ash trees shall be replaced by a less allergenic tree from the City Forrester's list of preferred trees.

9. Sustainability/Water Harvesting:

- A. Curb notches shall be added to the large landscape islands near the subject site's eastern side and to the southwestern portion of the main lot to allow runoff water to be used for supplemental irrigation purposes.
- B. Landscaping islands and beds shall be at grade with the parking lot (not raised) so the curb notches can function.

10. Architecture:

- A. An additional design option from the list in Zoning Code §14-16-3-18 (D)(2) shall be applied to the south elevation and the east elevation.
- B. The color of the metal panels shall be specified as metallic or Delphi silver.
- C. The color and finish of the service doors shall be specified.

11. Architecture- Clean-up:

- A. The correct scale shall be listed on the elevations.

- B. The elevations shall be labeled with the correct cardinal direction (north, south, east and west).
- C. The elevations shall be drawn so that they match the correct scale.

12. Signage- Free-standing:

- A. The recently updated, free-standing signs shall comply with the Shopping Center regulations [Zoning Code §14-16-3-2].
- B. All dimensions of the free-standing signs, including height, shall be specified.
- C. Lighting of the free-standing signs, if any, shall be specified.

13. Signage- Building-mounted:

- A. The size of the building-mounted signs shall be calculated and the sign area shall be shown clearly on the elevations.
- B. Letter color shall be specified and shall be at least 70% contrast with the background.
- C. The size of proposed sign E-1 and P-1 shall be specified.

14. Outdoor Space:

- A. Seating along at least one façade shall be provided at the rate of 1 seat for every 25 linear feet, which is 11 seats for the primary façade [Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(D)(3)].
- B. Seating and shading covering at least 25% of the plaza area shall be provided [Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(C)(4)].
- C. 300 square feet of outdoor gathering space for employees, with shading, shall be provided pursuant to Zoning Code §14-16-3-18(D)(3).
- D. A pathway across the landscaping to the employee break area shall be provided.

15. Utilities:

All exterior utility boxes, electrical and gas meters, transformers, etc., shall be screened from view.

16. Grading & Drainage Plan:

The vicinity map and the aerial map shall show the subject site as depicted on the site development plan for building permit sheet.

17. Minor “clean-up”:

- A. A note shall be added to state that all mechanical work shall be conducted indoors.
- B. Cross-hatching shall be deleted from the landscape buffer.
- C. The existing flagpole shall be shown as proposed for removal and, if desired, a new location for the flag pole shall be shown.
- D. Minor spelling, grammar and typographical errors shall be corrected.

18. CONDITIONS FROM PNM:

- A. PNM has numerous electric facilities at this site currently serving existing customers. The applicant shall coordinate with PNM regarding these existing facilities. Any relocation, changes or realignment of existing electric utilities will be the developer’s expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to physical, use or safety clearance constraints.
- B. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems. Any existing and proposed public utility easements shall be indicated on the site plan utility sheet prior to DRB review. PNM’s standard for public utility easements is 10 feet in width to ensure adequate, safe clearances.
- C. Screening shall be designed to allow for access to utility facilities. It is necessary to provide adequate clearance of ten feet surrounding all ground-mounted utilities for safe operation, maintenance and repair purposes.

19. CONDITIONS FROM THE CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT and NMDOT:

- A. All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.

-
- B. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
 - C. The applicant should only provide striped parking to meet zoning requirements (i.e. customer and employee parking). All other parking should be designated as vehicle display areas. In addition, unless required to meet zoning requirements (i.e. landscaping, lighting, etc.), the applicant could delete parking end caps for vehicle display areas. However, the applicant will need to provide protection for site lighting (i.e. bollards, concrete posts, landscaped end caps, etc.).
 - D. Virginia Street provides full access to the site. Therefore, delete the 35' full access site drive located on Lomas Boulevard east of Virginia Street. Right turn in right turn out access to the site from Lomas may be considered per the DPM. A suggested location could be approximately 120 feet to the east of the existing drive, which would align with a proposed, continuous north-south drive-aisle.
 - E. Label existing site drives.
 - F. Label the service department entrance and exit. Label parts department.
 - G. Provide location of new vehicle transport trucks.
 - H. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.
-

Catalina Lehner, AICP
Senior Planner

cc: Larry H. Miller Chrysler Jeep Dodge, 9350 S 150 E, Suite 1000, Sandy, UT 84070
Tierra West LLC, 5571 Midway Park Place NE, Albuquerque, NM 87109
Nancy Bearce, La Mesa Comm. Improvement Assoc./District 6 Coalition of N.A.s, 600 San Pablo NE, Albuquerque, NM 87108
Rose Walker, La Mesa Community Improvement Assoc., 1033 Utah NE, Albuquerque, NM 87110
Claude Lewis, District 6 Coalition of N.A.s, 465 Jefferson NE, Albuquerque, NM 87108

CITY OF ALBUQUERQUE AGENCY COMMENTS

PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Zoning Code Services

Office of Neighborhood Coordination

La Mesa Community Improvement Assoc. (R)

District 6 Coalition of NAs

9/8/09 – Recommended for facilitation – swatson

9/8/09 – Assigned to Tonya Covington – swatson

9/10/09 – A “No Meeting Report” filed by Tonya Covington - siw

Long Range Planning

Reviewed; no comment.

CITY ENGINEER

Transportation Development Services

- All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.
- The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
- The applicant should only provide striped parking to meet zoning requirements (i.e. customer and employee parking). All other parking should be designated as vehicle display areas. In addition, unless required to meet zoning requirements (i.e. landscaping, lighting, etc.), the applicant could delete parking end caps for vehicle display areas. However, the applicant will need to provide protection for site lighting (i.e. bollards, concrete posts, landscaped end caps, etc.).
- Virginia Street provides full access to the site. Therefore, delete the 35’ full access site drive located on Lomas Boulevard east of Virginia Street. Right turn in right turn out access to the site from Lomas may be considered per the DPM.
- Are site drives existing? If so, label them.
- Label the service department entrance and exit. Label parts department.
- Where are new vehicles delivered? Provide location of new vehicle transport trucks.
- Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.

Traffic Engineering Operations

Hydrology

- The Hydrology Section has no adverse comments on the site plan.

DEPARTMENT of MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT

Transportation Planning

- Reviewed, and no comments regarding on-street bikeways, off-street trails or roadway system facilities.

Traffic Engineering Operations (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

Street Maintenance (Department of Municipal Development):

- No comments received.

New Mexico Department of Transportation (NMDOT):

- No comments received.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS FROM CITY ENGINEER, MUNICIPAL DEVELOPMENT
and NMDOT:**

Conditions of approval for the proposed Site Development Plan for Building Permit shall include:

- A. All the requirements of previous actions taken by the EPC and/or the DRB must be completed and /or provided for.
- B. The Developer is responsible for permanent improvements to the transportation facilities adjacent to the proposed site development plan, as may be required by the Development Review Board (DRB).
- C. The applicant should only provide striped parking to meet zoning requirements (i.e. customer and employee parking). All other parking should be designated as vehicle display areas. In addition, unless required to meet zoning requirements (i.e. landscaping, lighting, etc.), the applicant could delete parking end caps for vehicle display areas. However, the applicant will need to provide protection for site lighting (i.e. bollards, concrete posts, landscaped end caps, etc.).
- D. Virginia Street provides full access to the site. Therefore, delete the 35' full access site drive located on Lomas Boulevard east of Virginia Street. Right turn in right turn out access to the site from Lomas may be considered per the DPM.

- E. Label existing site drives.
- F. Label the service department entrance and exit. Label parts department.
- G. Provide location of new vehicle transport trucks.
- H. Site plan shall comply and be designed per DPM Standards.

WATER UTILITY AUTHORITY

Utility Services

ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH DEPARTMENT

Air Quality Division

Environmental Services Division

PARKS AND RECREATION

Planning and Design

Reviewed, no objection. Request does not affect our facilities.

Open Space Division

Open Space has no adverse comments

City Forester

- Trees are woody plants that can reach over 15' tall
 - Lagerstroemia fauriei has many cultivars and several are over 20 feet tall – Move to tree category and state minimum height for whichever cultivar is chosen or choose cultivar now and place in shrub or tree category as appropriate
 - It can only be counted for coverage if left to branch to the ground
- 75% of trees in the parking lot need to be shade trees – 14-16-3-10-G-1-d. Redbuds and Chitalpa don't meet the requirement.
 - Why would they choose low spreading trees blocking the view of all the cars? Why not choose large trees so the view is open?
 - Stated tree sizes for Redbud and Chitalpa can't be expected in Albuquerque much less in the center of a parking lot in such small planters.
- The existing trees along Lomas and Virginia have recently been topped creating an extremely poor appearance and long term health and safety issues. These trees should not be allowed to remain or count towards any street tree or landscape requirements.

- Planting detail should read that root collar sets planting depth not top of rootball
- Water harvesting potential in large islands along Wyoming, SW corner of main lot along Virginia. Pervious pavements connecting all internal islands will act as water harvesting for trees, reduce heat island impacts, and clean / filter the storm water created on site
- Sheet C1 and C4 west parking area tree island layout don't match. If C4 is correct... Why are there so few trees in the west parking area? If C1 is correct then tree numbers don't add up. 1 tree per 10 spots and no spots more than 100' from a tree
- Buffering to residential areas to the south?
- Lights placed in the tree wells will create problems with managing trees and effective light reaching anything when trees mature. Move pole bases to outside of tree well on side light is directed to remove any future conflict.

POLICE DEPARTMENT/Planning

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT

Refuse Division

FIRE DEPARTMENT/Planning

TRANSIT DEPARTMENT

Adjacent and nearby routes	Route #31, Wyoming route, and Route #98, Peak hour Wyoming route pass the site on Wyoming in the southbound direction. Route #11, Lomas route, passes the site on Lomas in the eastbound direction.
Adjacent bus stops	There are 2 bus stops adjacent to the site. The first one is located on Lomas approximately 60' west of the Lomas/ Wyoming intersection serving the #11 or Lomas route. The second one is located on Wyoming approximately 150' south of the Lomas/Wyoming intersection, serving the #31 and #98 Wyoming routes.
Site plan requirements	None
Large site TDM suggestions	N/A
Other information	None.

COMMENTS FROM OTHER AGENCIES

BERNALILLO COUNTY

ALBUQUERQUE METROPOLITAN ARROYO FLOOD CONTROL AUTHORITY

Reviewed, no comment.

ALBUQUERQUE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

This will have no adverse impacts to the APS district.

MID-REGION COUNCIL OF GOVERNMENTS

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT

PUBLIC SERVICE COMPANY OF NEW MEXICO

- A. PNM has numerous electric facilities at this site currently serving existing customers. As a condition, it will be necessary to coordinate with PNM regarding these existing facilities. Any relocation, changes or realignment of existing electric utilities will be the developer's expense. In some cases, relocation or changes to existing facilities may not be feasible due to physical, use or safety clearance constraints. PNM will review all technical needs, issues and safety clearances for its electric power systems. Any existing and proposed public utility easements are to be indicated on the site plan utility sheet prior to DRB review. PNM's standard for public utility easements is 10 feet in width to ensure adequate, safe clearances.
- B. Screening should be designed to allow for access to utility facilities. As a condition, it is necessary to provide adequate clearance of ten feet surrounding all ground-mounted utilities for safe operation, maintenance and repair purposes.